



The Task Force on Court Facilities  
303 Second Street, South Tower, San Francisco, CA 94107-1366

**Meeting Minutes**  
July 27 and 28, 1998  
Sheraton Harbor Island Hotel, San Diego, California

**ATTENDEES:**

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS:**

**PRESENT:**

Hon. Daniel J. Kremer, Chair  
Mr. Greg Abel  
Mr. Wylie A. Aitken  
Hon. Joan B. Bechtel  
Ms. Yvonne Campos  
Mr. John A. Clarke  
Sheriff Robert T. Doyle  
Hon. Jerry Eaves  
Hon. Gary Freeman  
Mr. David Janssen  
Mr. Fred Klass  
Hon. Michael E. Nail  
Hon. Wayne Peterson  
Hon. Charles V. Smith  
Mr. Eugene A. Spindler II  
Mr. Anthony Tyrrell  
Hon. Diane Elan Wick

**ABSENT:**

Hon. Martha Escutia

**PRESENTERS:**

Mr. Frederick Ohlrich, Court Administrator of the Los Angeles, Inglewood, and South Bay Municipal Courts  
Ms. Barbara Fox, Chief Assistant Executive Officer, Trial Courts of Alameda County  
Mr. Anthony Williams, Legislative Analyst, Office of Governmental Affairs, Administrative Office of the Courts  
Ms. Taryn Ravazinni, Legislative Assistant / Judicial Administration Fellow, Office of Governmental Affairs, Administrative Office of the Courts  
Hon. Conrad C. Rushing, Judge, Santa Clara County Consolidated Courts

**TASK FORCE STAFF:**

Mr. Robert Lloyd – Project Coordinator / Senior Facilities Planner  
Mr. Bruce Newman – Facilities Planner

**CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE:**

Mr. Bob Newsom, Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall  
Mr. Andy Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall  
Mr. Jeff Buck, Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall  
Ms. Kim Steinjann, Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall  
Mr. Dennis Shew, Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall  
Mr. Dan Smith, DSA-Vitetta  
Mr. Mike Thomas, Justice Planning Associates  
Mr. Don Dwore, Spillis Candella Partners

**GUESTS:**

Mr. John Tozer, Manager, Business Services, Administrative Office of the Courts  
Ms. Sue Bost, Capital Outlay, California Department of Finance  
Ms. Francine Batchelor, Trial Court Services Division, Administrative Office of the Courts  
Mr. Arnold W. Winston, San Diego Municipal Court  
Mr. Jeff Gately  
Mr. Dean J. Felton, San Diego Municipal Court  
Ms. Catherine M. Knighten, Orange County  
Ms. Kellie Bieber, Orange County

## **MONDAY, JULY 27, 1998**

### **I. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME – Justice Daniel Kremer**

- 1) Justice Kremer called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. and welcomed members of the Task Force, staff and guests.
- 2) The Task Force members introduced themselves indicating their current position, background, areas of expertise, and special interests. The AOC staff and Consultant team briefly introduced themselves noting their position relative to the Task Force and their professional background.
- 3) Justice Kremer gave an overview of the objectives of the meeting, including:
  - a) Clarifying the charge, duties, and objectives of the Task Force based upon statute.
  - b) Providing educational material on the California court system, court facility planning, and courthouse design.
  - c) Determining the operating procedures of the Task Force including organizational structure and schedule.
  - d) Reviewing and adopting a work plan for accomplishing the charge of the Task Force.
- 4) Justice Kremer reviewed the specific provisions of the "Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997" (the Act) that established the Task Force on Court Facilities. Specifically:
  - a) Emphasized that the Task Force is an independent body of state government created by the Act that reports directly to the Governor, Legislature, and Judicial Council.
  - b) Reviewed the charter of the Task Force noting the magnitude and complexity of the task ahead.
  - c) Noted that the Task Force is already behind schedule when compared with the legislated milestone dates. Completing the project by July 1, 2001, as stipulated in the Act, is feasible but will require a diligent effort by all because of the breadth and size of the Task Force's charter.
  - d) In order to complete its work, the Task Force must make preliminary determinations of acceptable standards for construction, renovation, and remodeling of court facilities. These determinations should be broad-based and reflect what's in the best interests of the California Judiciary as a whole. Justice Kremer noted that it is not the mission of the Task Force, nor do they have the authority, to enact new facility standards for the courts.
- 5) Justice Kremer reviewed the Task Force guiding principles (attachment #1).
- 6) Meetings will be open to the public.
- 7) All Task Force members present took the oath of public office.

### **II. THE CALIFORNIA COURT SYSTEM – Frederick (Fritz) Ohlrich, Barbara Fox**

- 1) Ms. Barbara Fox and Mr. Fritz Ohlrich presented an overview of the California court system, describing the differences and similarities among the trial courts. Organizational charts gave graphic representations of the differences in size and structure of small, medium and large courts. They emphasized the importance of the courthouse and other facilities in carrying out the courts' responsibilities in an efficient, and orderly manner. They also stressed the need for a safe environment that is sensitive to its users and reflective of the institution. The importance of good planning was discussed while noting that decisions made early in the process are not easily changed later.
- 2) Ms. Fox and Mr. Ohlrich also discussed the unification of the Superior and Municipal Courts as a result of State Constitutional Amendment #4 (SCA 4). The jurisdiction of the Superior courts is felony criminal cases and civil cases involving more than \$25,000. Municipal Courts are responsible for misdemeanor criminal cases and civil cases involving less than \$25,000. The principal purpose of unification is to maximize judicial resources through operational efficiency. SCA 4 allows for the voluntary unification of the trial courts based upon a vote of the judges. As of July 24, 1998, of the fifty-eight California counties, 38 voted to unify and were certified and eleven counties are in the process of voting.

### **III. Trial Court Funding Overview – Anthony Williams, Taryn Ravazzinni**

- 1) Mr. Anthony Williams and Ms. Taryn Ravazzini discussed how the “Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997” was designed to:
  - a) increase the state’s responsibility for funding the courts, recognizing it as a state system while keeping in mind local considerations, and
  - b) provide significant fiscal relief to counties as well as a stable funding source for the courts.
 Mr. Williams also stated that the issues underlying responsibility for facilities and human resources were too complex to resolve in the Act so two separate Task Forces were created to review the issues and make recommendations to the Governor, Legislature and Judicial Council.
- 2) Mr. Williams pointed out that, under the Act, counties continue, through June 30, 2001, to be responsible for facilities supporting judicial positions and court staff in place before July 1, 1996. The state is responsible for facilities for judicial positions created between January 1, 1998 and June 30, 2001.
- 3) Mr. David Janssen commented that the forty new judicial positions currently being considered would, if authorized, bifurcate fiscal responsibility for trial court facilities. Mr. Janssen also noted that while the Act addressed the need for new or modified court facilities it did not mention prioritizing those needs. Justice Kremer responded that establishment of priorities is inherent in the Task Force’s work.

#### **IV. TASK FORCE PLANNING – Robert Lloyd**

- 1) Mr. Lloyd discussed the Judicial Council’s responsibility to provide staff support to the Task Force under the Act. He also noted that the California Department of General Services, Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst were required to provide staff support at the request of the Judicial Council. Mr. Lloyd stated that the following people/positions were specifically assigned to support the Task Force:
  - a) Robert Lloyd, Architect – Project Coordinator/Senior Facilities Planner (Full time)
  - b) Bruce Newman - Facilities Planner (Half time)
  - c) Staff Analyst (Full Time) - Position is vacant and being recruited
  - d) Benita Downs – Judicial Secretary (Part time)
  - e) Jonathan Wolin – Trial Court Services Division Liaison
 He also noted that the Judicial Council’s Administrative Office of the Court’s (AOC) would provide general support for conference planning, travel, administrative services, and legal services.
- 2) While the Act was pending enactment, AOC recognized it did not have the “in-house” resources required to support the large, multi-faceted study of facilities and financial issues that would be necessary to adequately support the Task Force. AOC, therefore, decided to seek contractual support from the justice planning and design community and issued a nationwide Request for Proposals (RFP). A selection committee reflecting the various constituencies represented by the Task Force membership was formed and conducted interviews with six teams of contractors who submitted proposals. The six teams were comprised of consultants specializing in all aspects of justice planning and design; the most recognized firms in this specialized area of the industry. Daniel, Mann, Johnson and Mendenhall / Spillis Candella Partners in association Vitetta Group, Justice Planning Associates was selected to provide consultant support for the Task Force.
- 3) Mr. Lloyd stated that in the months preceding this first Task Force meeting, the Task Force staff and consultant:
  - a) Developed a proposal for a professional, policy neutral work plan for studying statewide court facilities and related issues which would be presented in detail later in the meeting;
  - b) Identified the necessary resources to complete the study.
  - c) Developed detailed costs for the work.
 During this period, the staff and consultants held numerous planning meetings, surveyed all counties to establish an initial court facilities database, developed data base concepts, and tested data gathering procedures at four test sites.

## **V. OVERVIEW OF CALIFORNIA COURT FACILITIES – Dan Smith**

- 1) Mr. Dan Smith presented an overview of California court facilities. He reviewed court facility statistics gathered by a survey of Counties. California has 397 court facilities with approximately 14.8 million square feet used for court functions. Eighty three percent of the court space (based upon square footage) is located in 13 counties. Facilities range in size from less than 1,000 square feet to more than 750,000 square feet. Twenty percent of the facilities are leased. State courts date from the 1850's to the present with the vast majority constructed after 1950. Mr. Smith did a photo presentation highlighting the "Ten Oldest", "Ten Newest", "Ten Largest" and the "Ten Most Architecturally Significant or Innovative" (in Mr. Smith's opinion) court facilities.
- 2) Judge Wayne Peterson asked what part jails will play in the court study. He noted that it is very expensive to transport prisoners in urban areas. Justice Kremer responded that although jails are not specifically addressed in the Act and are not, strictly speaking "court facilities", they are related to court function and as such their relationship to the operation of the court should be addressed by the Task Force.

## **VI. TOUR SAN DIEGO HALL OF JUSTICE/SAN DIEGO COUNTY COURTHOUSE – Judge Wayne Peterson**

- 1) Judge Wayne Peterson, Mr. Ming Yim and Ms. Marilyn Laurence of the San Diego Superior Court led a tour of the new Hall of Justice. They highlighted the features of the new court, particularly the layout and design of the courtrooms, security, circulation, and public spaces. The older San Diego County Courthouse was subsequently toured. The makeshift security, poor circulation and handling of the public contrasted sharply with the new Hall of Justice.

## **DAY 2 TUESDAY, JULY 28, 1998**

## **VII. DEVELOPMENT OF THE 1991 CALIFORNIA TRIAL COURT FACILITY STANDARDS – Judge Conrad Rushing**

- 1) Judge Rushing explained that he chaired the "Judicial Council's Advisory Committee on Court Facilities" that developed the "California Trial Court Facility Standards" adopted by the Judicial Council in 1991. The Advisory Committee collected court facility standards from all states having them and cataloged and compared the information. The 1991 standards addressed only new construction. No attempt was made to establish standards for remodeling nor renovation projects. The California standards recommended a single prototypical trial courtroom; no effort was made to create standards for specialized courtrooms. "The Hidden Dimension" by Edward T. Hall was used as a guideline for appropriate distances to be maintained for different personal interactions, for example, personal, social and public. The prototypical courtroom was demonstrated by comparing photographs of an actual courtroom in Santa Clara County with diagrams illustrating the design principles contained in the 1991 standards. Judge Rushing discussed the three-zone circulation system typical of new courthouse design. The three-zone system maintains separation between the public, staff, and prisoners in the courthouse saving significant operational costs which rapidly repays the additional construction cost.

## **VIII. CURRENT TRENDS IN COURT FACILITY STANDARDS & DESIGN – Andy Cupples, Mike Thomas**

- 1) Mr. Cupples and Mr. Thomas discussed current trends in courthouse standards and design emphasizing that change in this area is constant. They noted that designing a facility causes the user to question how they do business and that financial considerations greatly influence the final design of a facility. For example, the decision to bundle (locate in one facility) the court as well as court related functions such as the district attorney) or unbundle court related functions is generally a financial decision not an operational or functional decision. They emphasized that an advocate from the court is instrumental for a successful facility project.

- 2) They discussed the increasing importance of security in courthouse design; both physical security and informational security. Not only must security be considered for judges and court staff, it must also be considered for the innocent bystander.
- 3) They said that the public has a renewed interest in the image of justice and want their courthouses to reflect the courts role in society. New courthouses are also placing more emphasis on serving the public.
- 4) They discussed courtroom size. There is a trend to build single function courtrooms recognizing that one size does not fit all. For example, family court courtrooms are often designed very differently from the traditional criminal court. They also noted that small and large court systems have different needs.
- 5) Mr. John Clarke asked if regional bundling of courts is a trend. Mike Thomas responded that it is typically not, because of the need to provide good local service.

#### **IX. FUTURE EDUCATIONAL GOALS/EVENTS – Justice Daniel Kremer, Robert Lloyd**

- 1) Justice Kremer and Mr. Lloyd discussed the need for continuing education of the Task Force in order to:
  - a) Increase knowledge of court operations and functional relationships;
  - b) Understand differences between court types;
  - c) Examine jurisdictional and regional differences;
  - d) Provide knowledge of courthouse design/ identify common problems / recognize good design;
  - e) Introduce alternate solutions to design problems;
  - f) Familiarize Task Force members with the condition of California courts' facilities.
- 2) Task Force education will be integrated with Task Force meetings and include presentations, panel discussions and tours of courts at different meeting locations. In addition, Task Force members may attend special conferences or seminars such as the American Institute of Architects' Third International Conference on Courthouse Design. A tour of nationally recognized courthouses outside of California is being planned to showcase excellent or unusual solutions to courthouse design problems and illustrate how other jurisdictions are addressing court facility needs.

#### **X. Review and Discussion of Draft Work Plan (Each phase was presented and then discussed.)**

- 1) Introduction – Mr. Dan Smith, the consultant team's project director, discussed the development of the proposed work plan which is entitled "Draft California Court Facility Study" and dated May 22, 1998. The work plan consists of two volumes: "Phase 1 Report" and "Phase 1 Appendix." Both were distributed prior to the meeting. The proposed study methodology is divided into five phases, each of which is detailed in the report. Examples of work performed in the development of the proposed work plan are included in the appendix.
- 2) Phase 1 Project Initiation – Jeff Buck
  - a) Mr. Buck explained that the "Project Initiation Phase", which was required by the consultant contract, was designed to develop and refine the scope of work necessary to accomplish the large and comprehensive task of examining every aspect of California Court facilities that the Task Force was chartered to do under the "Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997." During the months preceding the first Task Force meeting, the principals of various firms of the consultant team held numerous planning sessions with AOC's project coordinator to discuss the scope of work, methodology of conducting the study, resource requirements, scheduling, and data systems. The work done was intended to be policy-neutral work; creating a process for gathering, archiving, and reporting information as well as identifying issues and recommendations for Task Force consideration.
  - b) The draft work plan proposes a restructuring of the milestones established in the act to improve the efficiency of the study and spread costs more equally through the three year life of the Task Force. The principle differences between the schedule proposed in the work plan and that contained in the Act are:

- (1) The work plan schedule completes the review of judgeship needs prior to inspecting and evaluating existing court facilities. This is recommended in order to ensure that the team evaluating existing facilities has information of the possible future growth of the court when determining what the future facility needs may be. This is instrumental in developing a comprehensive and efficient capital investment plan for adequate and functional court facilities.
- (2) The proposed schedule extends the time for completing facility evaluation from 12 months to 24 months because of the magnitude of the process of evaluating court facilities. This is the most expensive part of the study and increasing the time for completion spreads the costs over multiple fiscal years equalizing cash flow. It also allows for the deployment of fewer field evaluation teams which increases the consistency of data collected.
- (3) The work plan extends the time for the review of facilities standards to one year to provide adequate time to the Task Force to consider the full impact of proposed standards.

Although the schedule adjusts interim milestones, the Task Force work is still completed

on or

before the date stipulated in the Act.

- c) Mr. Buck noted that adoption of the work plan would require “clean-up” legislation to conform interim milestone dates in the Act with those contained in the proposed work plan.

### 3) Phase 2 Standards – Dan Smith

- a) Mr. Dan Smith outlined the proposed process for reviewing court facility standards and making preliminary determinations of acceptable standards. He characterized facilities and operational standards as the “bridge” between court function and form. There are a number of types of standards that should be considered including objective standards (i.e. one courtroom for each judge); operational standards (i.e. all courtrooms cabled for video); philosophical issues (i.e. design should reflect judicial role in society) and organizational issues (i.e. family courts should incorporate special needs such as children’s waiting room).
- b) The consultant team will gather, review, and compare standards from other states, the administrative office of the U.S. courts, the National Center for State Courts and possibly other agencies like the Federal General Services Administration and State Architect.
- c) Past utilization of the current “California Trial Court Facility Standards” will be examined to determine the extent of utilization; why they were used or not used; the benefit they provided the court; any problems they created; and recommendations for improvements. A survey of all courts constructed since 1991 is proposed as well as in-depth evaluation of three post 1993 court construction projects.
- d) Key issues will be identified and position papers prepared for presentation to the Task Force. Recommendations will also be presented and will include a fiscal prudence review. The impact of the standards will be tested and analyzed.

### 4) Phase 3 Projections – Mike Thomas

- a) Mr. Thomas explained the methodology proposed for projecting the future needs of the court. He emphasized that the “modelling” proposed for the facility study was designed to predict possible future court facility needs within a region and was not designed to justify additional judgeships for a particular court. He also noted that the accuracy of state wide predictions will be better than those developed on a regional basis within counties due to the larger base of information analyzed. He handed out a booklet to Task Force members entitled “Phase 3 Methodology”. The publication outlined projection tasks, system modeling, forecasting models, and statistical information on appellate, superior, and municipal court caseloads. [Correction: Fig. B.2, “Total Juvenile Filings” should read “Total Traffic Filings.”]
- b) “Prescriptive” projections using weighted case analysis with a ratio of judicial positions per number of cases, have been a problem in the past. “Predictive” projections are forecasts based on historical trends, and are proposed for use in this study. Historical trends will be analyzed beginning with 1981 data. The forecasting methodology goes from

the general (more accurate) to the specific (less accurate). Forecasts will incorporate several models, and results will be leveled as required. Statewide forecasts will be allocated at the county level, and cross-checked with county-level forecasts. Judicial staffing numbers for regions within counties will be allocated rather than projected from county totals.

- c) The Task Force will be asked to review results against real-world experience.
- d) Mr. Thomas reviewed some preliminary statistics on case filings. He note that traffic statistics were removed from some analyses because they account for most of the cases and would skew results. He also indicated that some of the preliminary results presented in the handout show negative numbers which will be researched further.
- e) Judge Wayne Peterson shared some personal experiences with trying to project facility needs. He found that facility needs based on historical use were greatly overestimated and that no one could have predicted how much organizational and operational changes and differences in litigation would reduce the need for new facilities. Mike Thomas commented that the Task Force will be facing a similar issue since there are no statistics for the effects of consolidation on facility needs. He emphasized that it is important to take a rational approach to projecting the effects of system change, and to validate results as much as possible with the Task Force's collective experience.
- f) Mr. Fred Klass suggested that the Task Force focus on articulating the need for new standards and on overcoming the existing court space shortfall since the creation of new judicial positions is very political and unpredictable. This will be most effective if quantified into dollars, and prioritized for action. He also noted that court operating costs are much greater than capital costs.
- g) Mr. David Janssen asked how the consultant team would quantify operational changes. Mike Thomas said this is why Task Force input will be critical, to check the assumptions and methodology. Mike said that generally system growth increases with population and that procedural changes, while perhaps very significant in an operational sense, have historically had relatively little effect upon the trend line of system growth. Mike added that, historically, facilities have been underbuilt rather than overbuilt..
- h) Judge Peterson mentioned that future use of technology will change ratios which applied in the past and may affect the configuration and number of judges required. Dan Smith clarified that technology will be studied in Phase 2, that the Task Force will be asked to make recommendations on how to apply technology, and that this will be factored into the Phase 3 projections.
- i) Judge Wayne Peterson emphasized the importance of upgrading existing facilities; cautioning not to concentrate solely on building new ones. Jeff Buck said that from his experience, 80% of most capital plan dollars go toward the upgrade of existing facilities.

#### **[Lunch break]**

- 5) Phase 4 Facility Evaluation – Don Dwore
  - a) Mr. Don Dwore outlined the proposed facility evaluation process noting that it is designed to assess the physical, functional, and spatial adequacy of existing court space. In addition, the field survey will document current ownership and operating costs; determine the cost of upgrading existing facilities to reasonably comply with acceptable standards and applicable codes; identify spatial shortages relative to current and future needs; and develop a plan to correct any projected spatial shortages. The culmination of this phase of the work would be a Capital Development Plan addressing court facility needs for the next ten (plus) years.
  - b) During this phase, a database management system will be developed to store and handle the vast amount of data collected. The system will be capable of forming the nucleus of a system for managing future capital outlay for the state wide court system.
  - c) Professional architect/planning teams will visit every court facility in the state, enter current condition data into the database, prepare drawings of existing facilities, and photograph them. This information, coupled with information on future court needs and existing county court master plans, will be utilized to create development plans for different regions of

- every county. A cost model will be created to estimate project costs for the capital development plan.
- d) Charles Smith asked what standard would be used to upgrade existing facilities. Bob Lloyd responded that the standard for existing facilities may be less than that for new ones. Andy Cupples further clarified that the intent is to get the highest and best use from existing facilities.
  - e) Mr. Fred Klass asked if the existing leased facilities have true leases. Dan Smith said that the team will get copies of the lease agreements.
- 6) Phase 5 Implementation Plan – Jeff Buck
- a) Mr. Buck explained that the two principle parts of Phase 5 are a comprehensive review of financing options and development of a strategy for implementing the Task Force's recommendations. While phase 5 is the culmination of the facility study, in fact, most of the work is scheduled concurrently with phases 2, 3 and 4. During this phase, data would be collected on current ownership and financing of court facilities as well as options that might be utilized in other jurisdictions but not in use in California. Different ownership, financing and regulatory options would be evaluated and presented to the Task Force with recommendations.
- 7) Conclusion – Dan Smith
- a) Mr. Smith concluded the discussion by re-emphasizing that the proposed work plan is a policy neutral “road map” of how to complete the study in the allotted time frame. Although the consultant team and Task Force staff have given the study a lot of thought, the Task Force may change or redirect any aspect of the study. The work plan will not be a static document but one that evolves and changes as the project progresses.

## **XI. ACTION ITEMS**

- 1) Approval of the work plan (Draft Phase 1 Report dated 5/22/98, scope of Phases 1 through 5)
  - a) The draft work plan was unanimously adopted with the following stipulations:
    - (1) Changes to the interim milestones contained in the “Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997” will be sought by staff, but the due date of the Task Forces final report will not be changed.
    - (2) Adjustments and fine-tuning of the plan may occur as the Task Force deems appropriate.
    - (3) Work of Phases 2 and 5 will begin immediately followed soon after by work on Phase 3.
- 2) Task Force Structure
  - a) The proposed Task Force structure was unanimously approved with the following modifications:
    - (1) Subcommittees may have more than 5 members.
    - (2) Task Force members may be ex-officio (non-voting) members of any subcommittee.
    - (3) An Executive Subcommittee will be composed of the Task Force Chair, plus the Chair of each of the other three subcommittees.
    - (4) The approved Task Force Structure is attached (attachment #2).
- 3) Ground Rules for Task Force Meetings
  - a) Proposed ground rules were unanimously approved with the following modifications:
    - (1) Task Force meetings will begin mid-morning on Wednesdays and end mid-afternoon on Thursdays. Subcommittee meetings may occur before the Wednesday Task Force meetings and/or after the Thursday Task Force meetings.
    - (2) Working lunches and dinners may be part of the Task Force meetings.
    - (3) Advance materials will be sent to Task Force members at least one and one-half weeks prior to the meeting.
    - (4) The approved Task Force Ground Rules are attached (attachment #3).
- 4) Meeting Locations and Schedule



- a) The proposed schedule (including meeting locations) was adopted by consensus with the understanding that the schedule will be modified per the changes noted in Item XI.3).a).(1) above.
- b) The approved schedule is attached (attachment #4).

## **XII. CLOSING REMARKS**

- 1) Justice Kremer noted that casual dress is appropriate for future Task Force meetings.
- 2) The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:15 pm.

## **GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

The Task Force is an executive level body; data collection, analysis and development of recommendations will be done by subcommittee or support staff and consultants and presented to the Task Force for action. The Task Force will:

- Resist the temptation of parochialism remembering we are an entity of State government broadly responsible to several constituencies;
- Welcome innovation but resist the temptation unnecessarily to reinvent the wheel instead drawing so far as possible on the best of what has been done by others;
- View the justice system as a whole; optimizing the whole rather than each piece;
- Take the long view remembering our recommendations can affect the justice system for decades to come;
- Keep an open mind remembering there is more than one way to solve a problem;
- Recommend achievable and cost effective solutions to problems.



The Task Force on Court Facilities  
303 Second Street, South Tower, San Francisco, CA 94107-1366

## **TASK FORCE STRUCTURE**

(Approved by the Task Force on Court Facilities - July 28, 1998)

**I.** The Task Force is an executive level body created in State government by A.B. 233. Task Force membership is a non-delegable public duty. While staff may advise and assist members, staff may not participate in Task Force business or cast votes on behalf of members.

**II. Subcommittees**, composed entirely of Task Force Members, will provide specific guidance and direction to staff/consultants on performance of work done in accordance with the Task Force approved work plan within their respective areas.

The following subcommittees will be established:

- Standards / Facility Evaluation Committee
- Future Needs / Projections Committee
- Financing / Implementation Committee
- Executive Committee (composed of Task Force Chair and 3 Committee chairs)

With the assistance of staff/consultants, the subcommittees will present their findings and recommendations to the entire Task Force.

Subcommittee members will be selected by the Task Force Chair based upon the expressed interest of Task Force members and self-nomination. The subcommittee members will be selected to reflect the varying constituencies represented by Task Force members. The subcommittee members will select their own chairperson. Task Force members may be ex-officio (non-voting) members of any subcommittee.

**III. Working Groups** may be created to examine specific issues under review by the Task Force. Possible examples might be a "Technology Working Group" and a "Security Working Group." Working Groups would work closely with staff/consultants in researching issues and developing recommendations for subcommittees/the Task Force to consider. Working groups would be proposed by a specific subcommittee and would report to that subcommittee. Working Groups may vary in size depending on the issues being examined. Members would be selected by the Subcommittee Chair based upon their expertise in the area being studied. A subcommittee member would be appointed as a liaison to the Working Group. Nominations will be solicited statewide.



The Task Force on Court Facilities  
303 Second Street, South Tower, San Francisco, CA 94107-1366

## **GROUND RULES FOR TASK FORCE MEETINGS**

(Approved by the Task Force on Court Facilities - July 28, 1998)

- PARTICIPATE FULLY
- FOCUS ON STATUTORY GOALS & OBJECTIVES REMEMBERING TASK FORCE'S GUIDING PRINCIPLES
- KEEP AN OPEN MIND - LISTEN
- CONSIDER EVERYONE'S INPUT; RESPECT THEIR POINT OF VIEW
- NO SIDE CONVERSATIONS DURING MEETINGS
- DO NOT MONOPOLIZE THE FLOOR
- RESPECT OTHERS
- MAINTAIN CONFIDENTIALITY
- WATCH TIME - BE ON TIME
- NO PHONES / AUDIBLE PAGER

## **MEETING LOGISTICS / RULES**

### **Location:**

Each Task Force meeting will be held at a different location. See proposed meeting schedule.

### **Dates:**

Task Force meetings will be scheduled one year in advance. Meetings will typically start mid-morning on Wednesdays and end mid-afternoon on Thursdays. Working lunches and dinners may be part of the Task Force meetings. Special meetings may be called by the Task Force Chair.

Subcommittee and working group meetings will be scheduled at least 30 days in advance. The agenda will reflect key milestones in the work plan. When advantageous, subcommittee / working group meetings will be scheduled in conjunction with Task Force meetings; typically before the Wednesday Task Force meetings and/or after the Thursday Task Force meetings.

### **Room Organization:**

At Task Force meetings, members will be seated at the principal table which shall be arranged in the manner to best facilitate discussion among members. Staff seating will be near the members' table. Limited seating for members of the public will be provided.

## **Communications:**

- Meeting Notification:
  - Meeting logistic information will be mailed a minimum of 3 weeks prior to the scheduled meeting.
  - Meeting agenda and materials will be delivered to Task Force members one and one-half weeks prior to the meeting.
  - A press release announcing the meeting will be issued one and one-half weeks prior to the meeting.
- Minutes:
  - Minutes documenting Task Force and subcommittee meetings' discussion and decisions will be prepared and distributed to members within two weeks of the meeting. Approval of the prior meeting's minutes will be the first order of business of the subsequent Task Force or sub-committee meeting.
  - Proceedings will not be tape recorded nor will verbatim transcripts of the meetings be prepared.
- Web Site:
  - The Task Force will establish a Web site to disseminate information to the public.
  - Notify public of the Web site through a press release and mailings.
  - Post information of current and past Task Force activities including schedules, agendas, minutes, reports, research, etc.

## **Discussion of Issues:**

Only Task Force members, subcommittee members, or those making presentations will participate in discussion or debate of issues. The chair, however, may recognize other individuals and allow them to speak, as the chair deems appropriate.



**The Task Force on Court Facilities**  
303 Second Street, South Tower, San Francisco, CA 94107-1366

Task Force Meeting	Committee / Working Group Meeting	Start Date	Finish Date	Day of Week	Location	Phase No.	Topics for Discussion
<b>TF 1</b>		<b>7/27/98</b>	<b>7/28/98</b>	<b>Mon-Tue</b>	<b>San Diego</b>	<b>1</b> <b>2</b> <b>3</b> <b>4</b> <b>5</b>	<b>Introductions, logistics, meeting schedule</b> <b>Work plan approval</b> <b>Work plan approval</b> <b>Work plan introduction</b> <b>Work plan introduction</b> <b>TF Education: Local facility tour</b>
	Committee Chairs	9/9/98	9/13/98	Wed-Sun	Toronto	2/4	TF Education: AIA International Courts Conference
<b>TF 2</b>		<b>9/21/98</b>	<b>9/25/98</b>	<b>Mon-Thu</b>	<b>Western US</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>TF Education: Facility tour</b>
	C 2 – Future Needs	10/7/98	10/7/98	Wed	Sacramento	3	3A Statewide projections, progress
<b>TF 3</b>		<b>10/7/98</b>	<b>10/8/98</b>	<b>WED-THU</b>	<b>Sacramento</b>	<b>2</b>  <b>3</b>  <b>5</b>	<b>2A Data collection progress</b> <b>2B Standards utilization results</b> <b>TF Education: 2C Key issues, panel discussion other jurisdictions (w/Phase 5)</b> <b>3A Statewide projections, progress</b> <b>TF Education: 5A Data collection, panel discussion other jurisdictions (w/Phase 2)</b> <b>TF Education: Local facility tour</b>
	C 3 – Stds/ Eval	10/21/98	10/21/98	Wed	San Francisco	2	2C Key issues, define (Distribute to Task Force for comment)
	C 4 -Stds/ Eval	11/4/98	11/4/98	Wed	San Francisco	2	2C Key issues, policy guidelines (Distribute to Task Force for comment)
<b>TF 4</b>		<b>11/18/98</b>	<b>11/19/98</b>	<b>Wed-Thu</b>	<b>San Francisco</b>	<b>2</b>  <b>3</b>	<b>2A Data collection results</b> <b>2C Key issues results</b> <b>3A Statewide projection results</b>

Task Force Meeting	Committee / Working Group Meeting	Start Date	Finish Date	Day of Week	Location	Phase No.	Topics for Discussion
						<b>4</b>	<b>Work plan and database description</b> <b>TF Education: Local facility tour</b>
	C 5 - Stds/ Eval	1/27/99	1/27/99	Wed	Riverside	2	2D Preliminary standards recommendations workshop
	W 1 - Database	1/27/99	1/27/99	Wed	Riverside	4	4A Database management system, workshop
	C 7 - Finance	1/27/99	1/27/99	Wed	Riverside	5	5A Data collection, financing and ownership alternatives
<b>TF 5</b>	C 8 – Future Needs	<b>1/27/99</b>	<b>1/28/99</b>	<b>Wed-Thur</b>	<b>Riverside</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2D Preliminary standards recommendations, discussion</b>
						<b>3</b>	<b>3B Countywide projections, progress</b>
						<b>4</b>	<b>4A Database management system, progress</b>
						<b>5</b>	<b>5A Data collection, progress</b>
							<b>TF Education: Local facility tour</b>
		3/24/99	3/24/99	Wed	Fresno	3	3B Countywide projections, progress
<b>TF 6</b>		<b>3/24/99</b>	<b>3/25/99</b>	<b>Wed-Thur</b>	<b>Fresno</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2E Impact of standards results</b>
						<b>3</b>	<b>3B Countywide projections, progress</b>
						<b>4</b>	<b>4C Facility surveys, progress</b>
							<b>TF Education: Local facility tour</b>
<b>TF 7</b>		<b>5/19/99</b>	<b>5/20/99</b>	<b>Wed-Thur</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2F Standards recommendations</b>
						<b>3</b>	<b>3B Countywide projections results</b>
						<b>4</b>	<b>4C Facility surveys, progress</b>
						<b>5</b>	<b>5A Data collection, discussion of alternatives</b>
							<b>TF Education: Local facility tour</b>